

1. (Amended) A method of making a metal tube which comprises

(A) providing an assembly which comprises

(1) a metal tube blank, and

(2) an elongate metal core which is surrounded and contacted by the tube blank;

(B) elongating the assembly by mechanical working thereof until the tube blank has been converted into a tube of desired dimensions;

(C) after step (B), subjecting the core to a treatment which (i) results in the core being in a stable stretched condition throughout its length, and (ii) does not substantially stretch the tube produced in step (B); and

(D) after step (C), removing the stretched core from the tube.

2. (Amended) A method according to Claim 1 wherein the core is composed of a metal which, when stretched by subjecting to a stretching force under the conditions in step (C) [in the form of] as a fully annealed sample,

(i) first stretches elastically until an elastic limit is reached, at which time the [length of the sample is] sample has a length S_1 and the stretching force is F_1 , and

(ii) then stretches plastically, without breaking, until (a) the length of the sample reaches a second value S_2 which is at least $1.06 S_1$ and (b) the stretching force reaches a second value F_2 , where F_2 is at least $1.4 F_1$.

10. (Amended) A method according to Claim 7 wherein

- 22
- (i) a work-hardened tube is prepared in step (B),
 - (ii) the assembly from step (B) is subjected to a treatment which removes at least some of the stresses from the core but does not remove all of the stresses from the tube produced in step (B), and
 - (iii) in step (2) the heating of the stretched core does not remove all the stresses from the tube produced in step (B).

23 B 24
20. (Amended) A method according to Claim 1 wherein the assembly, [at the end of] immediately after step (B), has a length of at least 100 meters, and is cut into lengths of less than 35 meters prior to step (C).

Remarks

Claims 1-23 are currently pending in this application. Claims 22 and 23 were withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. Claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 USC §112 because of minor informalities. Claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Takamura et al. Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Takamura et al in view of Thiruvarudchelvan, alone, or in combination with Ohashi et al.

It is requested that the Examiner consider the art submitted in an Information Disclosure Statement filed on August 2, 1995 in connection with this application. The Examiner is requested to return an initialed and signed copy of the PTO-1449 once the documents have been considered.

24